



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CR

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,297	08/01/2003	Prakash Sikchi	MS1-1558US	3701
22801	7590	09/08/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			BOTT, MICHAEL K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,297	SIKCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12,15,17-36 and 38-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12,15,17-36 and 38-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/30/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Response to March 20, 2006 Office Action, which was filed on June 20, 2006.
2. The Abstract of the disclosure was objected to. Applicants have appropriately amended the Abstract. Accordingly, the objection to the Abstract is withdrawn.
3. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected to under 25 U.S.C. 101 and 112, second paragraph. Applicant has cancelled claims 13 and 14 and the rejections are therefore moot.
4. Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, and 38-49 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 15, 17, 29, 30, 31, and 34 being the independent claims.
5. Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, and 38-49 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. A signed and dated copy of applicant's IDS, which was filed on May 30, 2006, is attached to this Office Action.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, and 38-49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Altova, Inc., "XML Spy 4.0 Manual," Altova Inc. & Altova GmbH, copyright 1998-2001, chapters 1, 2, and 6, encompassing pages 1-17, 18-90, and 343-362, respectively, [hereinafter "XML Spy"].

Regarding **dependent claim 1**, XML Spy teaches:

A method for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, the input document pertaining to a first kind of document, and the output document pertaining to a second kind of document, comprising:

providing a translation file that converts documents of the first kind to documents of the second kind;

in a first phase, modifying the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of documents of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, the first phase producing a modified translation file;

in a second phase, using the modified translation file to convert the input document into the output document, including:

activating the mapping functionality; and

using the mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document.

(See, XML Spy, pages 1-17, teaching an XML file, XML Schema, XML transform and editing in a database view. See also, XML Spy, pages 73-90, teaching the translation of an XML file to HTML using and XSL transformation as the translation file. See also, XML Spy, pages 343-362, teaching editing an XML, XSL, HTML or other file format including a mapping functionality that provides references in the output document that associates parts of the output document with parts of the input document.

It is noted that no special definition of the term "phase" was found in the specification. The term "phase" would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art to be defined as follows: "an aspect" or "a part." See, "The American Heritage College Dictionary," Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002. Consistent therewith, the Examiner reads the term "phase" to be a part of the transformation of a document after it is taken from the original document or prior to being input into the final document, such that it is in the beginning or end of the process of being transformed. The term "phase" shall be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

It is noted that "a first phase, modifying the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of document of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, the fits phase producing a modified translation file," is inherent if processing a document

through an XSL transformation. Additionally, such relationship functionality in a “first phase” is found in any stylesheet or schema translation.

Further, it is noted that “a second phase, using the modified translation file to convert the input document into the output document,” is also inherent in the use of an XSL transformation. Still further, a “mapping functionality” providing “references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document” is expressly taught in XML Spy. In addition, see, XML Spy, page 111-117, teaching that a user may view an XML file, or the output of an XSLT transformation to HTML, or and XSL stylesheet associated with an XML document, it was available in XML Spy in a browser window. In that the document was able to track back and forth between the original and translated versions, it is inherent that there was a mapping functionality between the input and output documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, where the first kind of document is a markup language document that uses tags pertaining to subject matter fields in the input document.

(See, XML Spy, pages 1-17, teaching an XML file, which has tags, as the first document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 2, wherein the first kind of document is expressed in the extensible markup language (XML).

(See, XML Spy, pages 1-17, teaching an XML file as the first document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the second kind of document is a markup language document that uses tags pertaining to visual features in the output document.

(See, XML Spy, pages 1-17, teaching an HTML file, which has tags, as the second document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 4, wherein the second kind of document is expressed in hypertext markup language (HTML).

(See, XML Spy, pages 1-17, teaching an HTML file as the second document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the output document comprises an electronic form having at least one data entry field therein, wherein the data

entry field is mapped to a corresponding part of the input document via at least one reference.

(See, XML Spy, pages 343-362, teaching an output document comprising an electronic form having data entry fields, wherein the data entry fields map to corresponding parts of the input document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, XML Spy teaches:

*The method according to claim 6, further comprising:
receiving information input by a user into the data entry field; and
modifying the corresponding part of the input document pointed to by the
at least one reference in response to the receiving.*

(See, XML Spy, pages 343-362, teaching an output document comprising an electronic form having data entry fields, wherein the data input by a user maps to corresponding parts of the input document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, XML Spy teaches:

*The method according to claim 1, wherein the translation file is expressed
in the extensible stylesheet language (XSL).*

(See, XML Spy, page 73, teaching that the transformation uses an XSL file. See also, XML Spy, page 349, teaching that the translation file is expressed in XSL transform language.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 8, wherein the modifying of the translation file includes adding extension functions to the translation file expressed in the extensible stylesheet language (XSL).

(It is noted that "extension functions" are disclosed as only one type of mapping functions. See, disclosure, page 26, line 23 through page 27, line 4.

Based on a review of the claims and the specification, the Examiner believes that Applicants intended the term "extension functions" to mean functions added to an XSLT document such that the functions will be mapped to the original and final documents, and the term will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

See, XML Spy, page 113-115, teaching that a user may directly edit within XSLT such that the changes will be mapped to the original and final documents. In addition, see, XML Spy, page 73, teaching extensions functions to the XSL files.)

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 9, wherein the activating of the mapping functionality includes calling the extension functions to return the references that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document.

(It is noted that "extension functions" are disclosed as only one type of mapping functions. See, disclosure, page 26, line 23 through page 27, line 4.

Based on a review of the claims and the specification, the Examiner believes that Applicants intended the term "extension functions" to mean functions added to an XSLT

document such that the functions will be mapped to the original and final documents, and the term will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

See, XML Spy, page 113-115, teaching that a user may directly edit within XSLT such that the changes will be mapped to the original and final documents.

In addition, see, XML Spy, page 73, teaching that the XSL extension functions are embodied in a user selectable icon. It is inherent in the provision of a selectable icon for use in a translation program that selection of the icon, by the user, will call the function associated with the icon.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the modifying of the translation file in the first phase includes adding the mapping functionality at locations in the translation file that mark context changes in the output document.

(See, XML Spy, pages 343-362, teaching modifications to the first file mapped to by the translation file to mark context changes in the output document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the modifying of the translation file in the first phase includes adding the mapping functionality at locations in the translation file that mark data items contained in the input document that are to be bound to corresponding parts in the output document.

(See, XML Spy, pages 343-362, teaching modifications to the first file mapped to by the translation file to mark data changes that are to be bound to corresponding parts in the output document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, XML Spy teaches:

*A method for generating mapping functionality that can map between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, the input document pertaining to a first kind of document, and the output document pertaining to a second kind of document, comprising;
providing a translation file that converts documents of the first kind to documents of the second kind; and
modifying the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of documents of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind.*

(Claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 17**, XML Spy teaches:

An apparatus for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, the input document pertaining to a first kind of document, and the output document pertaining to a second kind of

document, and further wherein a translation file converts documents of the first kind to documents of the second kind, the apparatus comprising;

annotation logic configured to modify the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of documents of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, to thereby provide a modified translation file;

a storage for receiving the modified translation file; runtime logic configured to convert the input document into the output document using the modified translation file in the storage, including:

activation logic configured to activate the mapping functionality; and

output logic configured to use the activated mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document.

(Claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 18**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, where the first kind of document is a markup language document that uses tags pertaining to subject matter fields in the input document.

(Claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 19**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 18, wherein the first kind of document is expressed in the extensible markup language (XML).

(Claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 20**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the second kind of document is a markup language document that uses tags pertaining to visual features in the output document.

(Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 20, wherein the second kind of document is expressed in hypertext markup language (HTML).

(Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 22**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the output document comprises an electronic form having at least one data entry field therein, wherein the data entry field is mapped to a corresponding part of the input document via at least one reference.

(Claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 23**, XML Spy teaches:

*The apparatus according to claim 22, further comprising:
receiving logic configured to receive information input by a data into the user entry field; and
editing logic configured to modify the corresponding part of the input document pointed to by the at least one reference in response to the receiving.*

(Claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 24**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the translation file is expressed in the extensible stylesheet language (XSL).

(Claim 24 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 25**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 24, wherein the annotation logic is configured to modify the translation file by adding extension functions to the translation file expressed in the extensible stylesheet language (XSL).

(Claim 25 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 26**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 25, wherein the activation logic is configured to activate the mapping functionality by calling the extension functions to return the references that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document.

(Claim 26 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 10 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 27**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the annotation logic is configured to modify the translation file in the first phase by adding the mapping functionality at locations in the translation file that mark context changes in the output document.

(Claim 27 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 11 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 28**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the annotation logic is configured to modify the translation file in the first phase by adding the mapping functionality at locations in the translation file that mark data contained in the input document that are to be bound to corresponding parts in the output document.

(Claim 28 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 12 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 29, as amended**, XML Spy teaches:

A computer readable medium having machine readable instructions for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, the input document pertaining to a first kind of document, and the output document pertaining to a second kind of document, and further wherein a translation file converts documents of the first kind to documents of the second kind, the apparatus comprising:

annotation logic configured to modify the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships

between parts of documents of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, to thereby provide a modified translation file;
a storage for receiving the modified translation file;
runtime logic configured to convert the input document into the output document using the modified translation file in the storage, including:
activation logic configured to activate the mapping functionality; and
output logic configured to use the activated mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document.

(Claim 29 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 30**, XML Spy teaches:

An apparatus for providing mapping functionality that maps between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, the input document pertaining to a first kind of document, and the output document pertaining to a second kind of document, and further wherein a translation file converts documents of the first kind to documents of the second kind, the apparatus comprising:

annotation logic configured to modify the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships

between parts of documents of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind; and
a storage for receiving the modified translation file.

(Claim 30 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 31**, XML Spy teaches:

A computer readable medium having stored thereon an information structure, comprising:
a plurality of translation elements configured to convert a first kind of document into a second kind of document; and
a plurality of functions interspersed amongst the plurality of translation elements, the plurality functions configured to provide a respective plurality of references, wherein the references provide pointers that link parts of the second kind of document with parts of the first kind of document.

(Claim 31 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 32**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium of claim 31, wherein a collection of the plurality of functions have respective positions amongst the plurality of translation elements so as to mark context changes in the second kind of document.

(Claim 32 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 11 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 33**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium of claim 31, wherein a collection of the plurality of functions have respective positions amongst the plurality of translation elements so as to mark data contained in the first kind of document that is to be bound with corresponding parts in the second kind of document.

(Claim 33 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 12 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 34**, XML Spy teaches:

A computer readable medium having stored thereon an information structure, comprising:
a plurality of translation elements configured to convert a first kind of document into a second kind of document; and
a plurality of references interspersed amongst the plurality of translation elements, wherein the plurality of references provide pointers that link respective parts of the second kind of document with parts of the first kind of document.

(Claim 34 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 35**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium of claim 34, wherein a collection of the plurality of references have respective positions amongst the plurality of translation elements so as to mark context changes in the second kind of document.

(Claim 35 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 36**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium of claim 34, wherein a collection of the plurality of references have respective positions amongst the plurality of translation elements so as to mark data contained in the first kind of document that is to be bound with corresponding parts in the second kind of document.

(Claim 36 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 38**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the translation file is expressed in an arbitrary format.

(Claim 38 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that

a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 39**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the modifying is performed in a substantially automatic fashion.

(See, XML Spy, page 74, teaching modifying by mapping functionality is substantially automatic, being initiated by clicking on an icon or clicking a hot key.)

Regarding **dependent claim 40**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 15, wherein the translation file is expressed in an arbitrary format.

(Claim 40 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 15 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 41**, XML Spy teaches:

The method according to claim 15, wherein the modifying is performed in a substantially automatic fashion.

(See, XML Spy, page 74, teaching modifying by mapping functionality is substantially automatic, being initiated by clicking on an icon or clicking a hot key.)

Regarding **dependent claim 42**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the translation file is expressed in an arbitrary format.

(Claim 42 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 17 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 43**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the annotation logic is configured to modify the translation file in a substantially automatic fashion.

(See, XML Spy, page 74, teaching modifying by mapping functionality is substantially automatic, being initiated by clicking on an icon or clicking a hot key.)

Regarding **dependent claim 44**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium according to claim 29, wherein the translation file is expressed in an arbitrary format.

(Claim 44 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 29 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 45**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium according to claim 29, wherein the annotation logic is configured to modify the translation file in a substantially automatic fashion.

(See, XML Spy, page 74, teaching modifying by mapping functionality is substantially automatic, being initiated by clicking on an icon or clicking a hot key.)

Regarding **dependent claim 46**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 30, wherein the translation file is expressed in an arbitrary format.

(Claim 46 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 30 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 47**, XML Spy teaches:

The apparatus according to claim 30, wherein the annotation logic is configured to modify the translation file in a substantially automatic fashion.

(See, XML Spy, page 74, teaching modifying by mapping functionality is substantially automatic, being initiated by clicking on an icon or clicking a hot key.)

Regarding **dependent claim 48**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium according to claim 31, wherein the translation elements are expressed in arbitrary format.

(Claim 48 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 31 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **dependent claim 49**, XML Spy teaches:

The computer readable medium according to claim 34, wherein the translation elements are expressed in an arbitrary format.

(Claim 49 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 34 and, in further view of the following is rejected along the same rationale. Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." See, disclosure, page 12, lines 7-15. The use of XSLT is expressly taught in XML Spy. See, XML Spy, pages 73-90 and 343-362, teaching use of XSLT in transforming XML documents to HTML or other documents.)

8. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed June 20, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding **rejections of independent claim 1**:

FIRST: Applicants argue that "Altova [cited in the Office Action as "XML Spy"]

does not describe that its various features are produced by modifying a translation file to include mapping functionality (in a first phase) and then activating the mapping functionality (in a second phase) in the manner recited in claim 1." See, Applicants' Response, pages 16-19.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, XML Spy, pages 73-90, teaching the translation of an XML file to HTML using and XSL transformation as the translation file.

It is noted that "a first phase, modifying the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of document of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, the fits phase producing a modified translation file," is inherent if processing a document through an XSL transformation. Additionally, such relationship functionality in a "first phase" is found in any stylesheet or schema translation.

Further, it is noted that "a second phase, using the modified translation file to convert the input document into the output document," is also inherent in the use of an XSL transformation. Still further, a "mapping functionality" providing "references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document" is expressly taught in XML Spy.

See also, XML Spy, pages 343-362, teaching editing an XML, XSL, HTML or other file format including a mapping functionality that provides references in the output document that associates parts of the output document with parts of the input document. In addition, see, XML Spy, page 111-117, teaching that a user may view an

XML file, or the output of an XSLT transformation to HTML, or and XSL stylesheet associated with an XML document, it was available in XML Spy in a browser window. In that the document was able to track back and forth between the original and translated versions, it is inherent that there was a mapping functionality between the input and output documents.

SECOND: Applicants argue that XML Spy “does not disclose the technical manner in which it achieves these results, and therefore does not disclose the specific subject matter of claim1.” See, Applicants’ Response, page 18.

The Examiner disagrees.

XML Spy amply teaches the “technical manner” of its invention. What is not expressly taught, but which is inherent, is that there is a first and second “phase” between a translation file. Between the original document and the XSL transformation is inherently a “phase” mapping the “parts” of the document. Similarly, between the XSL transform and the final document is inherently another “phase” mapping the “parts” of the document. Without the functionality of “mapping” during these “phases” there would be no way to make the transformation – there would be nothing more than a random assignment of parts between the original and final documents. The fact of the ordered transformation would indicate to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that there is inherently contained within the transformation program a mapping functionality that is consistent during the mapping phases.

Regarding rejection of independent claim 15:

Applicants argues that “Altova [XML Spy] does not describe that its various features are produced by modifying a translation file to include mapping functionality in the manner recited in claim 15.” See, Applicants’ Response, pages 19-20.

The Examiner disagrees.

Claim 15 merely specifies that a mapping functionality exists and that it operates on the data after input of the original document and before output of the final document. Claim 15 does not specify the mapping function other than the obvious description of mapping that it “can provide information regarding relationships between parts of documents of the first kind [the original document] and associated parts of documents of the second kind [the final document].

Between the original document and the XSL transformation is inherently a mapping of the document. Similarly, between the XSL transform and the final document is inherently another mapping of the document. Without the functionality of “mapping” there would be no way to make the transformation – there would be nothing more than a random assignment of parts between the original and final documents. The fact of the ordered transformation would indicate to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that there is inherently contained within the transformation program a mapping functionality.

Regarding rejection of independent claim 31:

Applicants argue that “Altova [XML Spy] does not disclose a plurality of

translation elements in conjunction with a plurality of functions which are interspersed amongst the plurality of translation elements in the manner recited in claim 31.”

Applicants argue more specifically that “Altova [XML Spy] does not describe that its various features are produced by interspersing a plurality of functions amongst the translation elements.” See, Applicants’ Response, pages 20-21.

The Examiner disagrees.

There is nothing in the claim or specification to indicate that “a plurality of translation elements in conjunction with a plurality of functions which are interspersed amongst the plurality of translation elements” is anything more than the inherent elements and functions within a sophisticated translation program, such as XSL, which is expressly taught in XML Spy.

Regarding rejections of dependent claims 9, 10, 25, and 26:

Applicants argue that XML Spy “does not mention the specific use of extension functions” See, Applicants’ Response, pages 21-22.

The Examiner disagrees.

It is noted that “extension functions” are disclosed as only one type of mapping functions. See, disclosure, page 26, line 23 through page 27, line 4.

Based on a review of the claims and the specification, the Examiner believes that Applicants intended the term “extension functions” to mean functions added to an XSLT document such that the functions will be mapped to the original and final documents, and the term will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

See, XML Spy, page 113-115, teaching that a user may directly edit within XSLT such that the changes will be mapped to the original and final documents.

Regarding rejection of claims 1-12, 15, 17, and 38-49:

Applicants argue that XML Spy is not an enabling reference. See, Applicants' Response, page 22.

The Examiner disagrees.

As identified above, XML spy expressly anticipates or makes obvious all of the elements of the claimed invention, and the reference is therefore presumed to be operable and enabling. The burden is on the Applicants to provide facts rebutting the presumption of operability. Applicants merely challenged the reference as non-enabling without providing facts. See, MPEP 2121.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER